

[home](#) [publish](#) [info](#) [links](#) [participate](#) [newswire](#) [FAQ](#) [contact](#) [TC-IMC](#) [sign](#)
[Home](#) >

Make Destroy Manarchism --and-- Shut the Fuck Up

Submitted by Anonymous on Sat, 05/09/2009 - 22:18

in [Local](#) [Anarchism](#) [anti-oppression](#) [manarchism](#) [patriarchy](#) [white supremacy](#) [Women & Feminism](#)

Certainly, this world doesn't need more words written by people like me - which is part of why, at the end of this note, I reproduce a more thoughtful, enduring essay than this one. But here and now, I nonetheless write as a white male-bodied, self-identified anarchist, understanding to the best of my ability the irony of using this medium to say to my male-bodied comrades who fight, rage, love, cry and struggle for social justice in the Twin Cities:

Please, wake up and shut up.

Newsflash (except to most everyone with a vagina): We are acting unacceptably, directly leading to the attrition of valuable, amazing, mostly female-bodied activists in our organizations and networks.

Newsflash: Female-bodied activists and others in our cities are sick of it. The number of them I know who have stepped back or dropped out from the struggle in the last few weeks directly attributable to elitist, macho, manarchist bullshit in which we are complicit and from which we (temporarily) benefit are far more than the number of charges we've successfully defeated, recruits we've gained, and even - even - riots we've fought during the same time. Needless to say - or perhaps, more necessary to say than we should've thought: this is not how to sustain anything.

Newsflash: This is a problem that men must take the lead in addressing. It is our responsibility, and it must be done immediately (barring that, yesterday would be nice).

In the article below, Dan Spalding focuses on quantity, imploring us to Shut The Fuck Up. Since realistically, this isn't going to happen to the extent it should right away, if ever - society's training runs deep - I want to focus on quality. The next time you find your mouth open, Wake The Fuck Up and listen to what you say. If you grew up on planet Earth, you may have a problem.

Let's start with premises: What does it mean to be militant?

I argue that militancy has far less to do with violence or physical fighting than with an aggressive refusal to be constrained. Breaking through the constraints of a police line is militant, yes. Sabotaging the property of a multinational corporation is militant, yes. So too is a radical health care collective, refusing to be constrained by a corporate system. Guerrilla gardening, too, is militant. Finding alternative sources of food is militant. Working from the office to support those facing possible repression is militant. Providing child care to radical moms is militant. On the other hand, violating security culture by bragging about your militant (probably not providing child care or food) activities is not militant: it leads to our friends and comrades being constrained. Glorifying violence above other action, too, is far from militant: it constrains those who contribute to the struggle in other ways, creating a hierarchy which leads to even more constraints.

It also makes a lot of your comrades spend time dealing with your shit instead of striving for our shared goals or struggling against our shared enemies.

Here's another one: What does it mean to be insurrectionary?

Movement Media for Minneapolis-St. Paul

I argue that insurrection is a state of open revolt against unjust authority. Often, insurrection must involve violence. For the act to exist, then, really, to exist in the first place - it must also involve deep feelings of love. Just as broken glass and a knife can be insurrection, genuine emotional support can be insurrection. Legal and jail support can be insurrection. Fundraising can be insurrection. A fire kitchen can be insurrection. Skills shares can be insurrection. Safe(r) housing can be insurrection, whites confronting racism can be insurrection, sexual assault awareness can be insurrection. Consensus process can be insurrection. [italy la plana liege liguria lille linksunten lon marseille nantes napoli netherlands nice norway oost-vlaanderen paris/île-de-france patras piemonte poland portu](#) When the unjust authority in question is hetero-patriarchy, shutting the fuck up can be insurrection. Constructively calling out the man who won't can be insurrection. [mador mexico peru puerto rico qollasuyu rosario santiago tijuana ur oceania adelaide aotearoa brisbane burma darwin jakarta manila melbourne perth qc sydney south asia india muml](#) Perhaps you still like to attack, attack, attack. Good. We need attack, too, really. But if your arsenal only contains slingshots and rocks, and therefore your targets are presumably limited to that which can be broken with the same, don't be surprised when I get the fuck out of the way. Being around you isn't safe and I don't consent to your rhetoric or your attacks. On the other hand, if your arsenal also includes with hugs, empathy, a closed mouth, a pen and paper, a spatula and dishrag and protest, and is capable of knocking in gliots and changing a diaper, holding it signed and holding back a man who does not piss about what he's doing - and your targets are the interlocking systems that can be attacked with these and other tools - then I will struggle by your side.

You want me to be willing to die for your cause? You have my commitment. I ask in return: are you willing to live for ours? Or is that too boring? In a world where we've been terribly trained from birth to lead with our mouths, our cocks and our guns - living, really living intentionally, honestly and compassionately for a cause and for those we love is the more difficult choice. It's the more militant, and - if this is what you're into - the more insurrectionary option.

I'm male-bodied. And I'm sick and tired. (I can only imagine how the rest of the planet must feel.) I'm sick of being told (explicitly or implicitly) that I'm not a good enough activist if I don't personally engage in violence or macho actions. Tired of politely poking my male friends in the back when they insist on trying to hold their own talking back to cops, down to women or up everyone's ears. Sick from taking on the extra work that still needs to get done when women get sick of manarchism and quite wisely drop out. Tired of wondering if it's worth identifying as an anarchist any more, when this is what it's associated with to so many activists whose work I respect and adore. Sick of listening to the same voices over and over again. And tired, so tired of frat boy behavior. Sick, sick and tired.

You want to make total destroy on banks? Make total destroy on politicians? Then you must also make total destroy on patriarchy. Make total destroy on white supremacy. Make total destroy on all forms of oppression. Because all liberation is bound together.

What is manarchy, then? It's what I perpetuate when I walk on University Avenue, see a man leaning out of a car screaming about "bitches!", and only realize exactly what's going on when I see a woman's raised middle finger across the street when the car screams past, too late for me to do anything even if I had the courage. It's what I struggle with after seeing frat boys riot the same evening, then sit through hearing my male-bodied comrades praise them (or scorn them for not being violent enough) the next day. It's what I nearly cry over and struggle to confront when a few days later, at a meeting, 15 male-bodied anarchists sit together on one side of the room and argue that more riots are what is most needed for our (our? whose?) struggle, other opinions and bodies be damned.

Being white and male, of course there is more I want to say. But you probably already know it, if you think about it. You might even agree or have heard it before, if you were listening. Anarchy, it has been said, is the union of freedom and responsibility. It likely comes as no surprise to the non-anarchists reading this that we have yet to realize either.

Shut the Fuck Up

or, How to act better in meetings

An open letter to other men in the movement

Dan Spalding

Oakland, May 2001

"Even with my mask I often spoke the tyranny of power. My first duty was to cultivate a revolutionary silence."
-Subcomandante Marcos

Introduction

Being an activist these days means fighting for a thousand different things - indigenous rights, rainforests, corporate accountability, etc. Despite this diversity of campaigns, there seems to be some agreement on the kind of society we want to create. It's a society that isn't based on white supremacy, class exploitation, or patriarchy.

This essay is about how men act in meetings. Mostly it's about how we act badly, but it includes suggestions on how we can do better. Men in the movement reproduce patriarchy within the movement and benefit from it. By patriarchy I mean a system of values, behaviors, and relationships that keeps men in power. It relies on domination, claiming authority, and belligerence. By the movement I mean the anti-corporate globalization movement in the US I am a part of.

I think people organizing for affordable housing, against police brutality, for the rights of immigrants (for example) are also fighting the same system that's wringing the blood out of the bottom 99 percent of the world's population and the environment they live in. However, I don't know from my experience if the men who organize around those issues act the way the men in the movement do.

Just to be clear, those men are almost always white and from middle-class or wealthier backgrounds. In my experience, as someone who identifies as a man of color, men of color dominate meetings in basically the exact same way. But I find that men who do not speak English fluently tend not to do so as much. I wish I could think of more exceptions.

Who cares about meetings?

Good question. Most meetings of large-ish organizations (of more than 30 people or so) I've been to don't amount to too much. The real work - doing research, getting people involved, organizing protests and actions, fundraising, media stuff - gets done by working groups or individuals. Meetings are just about a lot of talking, right?

Well, yes and no. At worst meetings force a lot of people to get together and generally discuss everything that's been done, everything that's going on, and everything that needs to be done. These meetings tend to wander a lot. Responsibility is not clearly delegated, decisions aren't made overtly, and the organization isn't more focused afterwards than before. At the same time, there's heated arguments over seemingly trivial things, or hurtful criticism of individuals. But those arguments and criticisms don't amount to too much in the end.

But a good meeting is a different animal altogether. With good self-facilitation and a good facilitator (or two, or three...), everyone contributes to the meeting, without anyone taking control over it. People make constructive criticism, and try to incorporate concerns raised into their proposals. And since everyone gets to contribute their ideas into the decision-making process, the decisions are not only the best possible ones - but also the ones people are most invested in. Since everyone feels ownership over the decisions, people are more likely to take on responsibility for projects.

If you're serious about using consensus, you have to care about meetings. That's the only place a group can democratically decide what to do and how to do it. The alternative is an informal group of the most influential and forceful members (who dominate discussion) making the big decisions.

It's not just how often you talk, but how and when

Consensus decision making is a model of the society we want to live in, and a tool we use to get there. Men often dominate consensus at the expense of everyone else. Think about the man who...

* Speaks for a long time, loud, first and often

- * Offers his opinion immediately whenever someone makes a proposal, asks a question, or if there's a lull in discussion
- * Speaks with too much authority: "Actually, it's like this..."
- * Can't amend a proposal or idea he disagrees with, but trashes it instead
- * Makes faces every time someone says something he disagrees with
- * Rephrases everything a woman says, as in, "I think what Mary was trying to say is..."
- * Makes a proposal, then responds to each and every question and criticism of it - thus speaking as often as everyone else put together (Note: This man often ends up being the facilitator)

And don't get me started about the bad male facilitator who...:

- * Always puts himself first on stack, because he can
- * Somehow never sees the women with their hands up, and never encourages people who haven't spoken

It's rarely just one man who exhibits every problem trait. Instead it's two or three competing to do all the above. But the result is the same: everyone who can't (or won't) compete on these terms - talking long, loud, first and often - gets drowned out.

This is a result of society's programming. Almost no men can actually live up to our culture's fucked up standards of masculinity. And our society has standards for women that are equally ridiculous. In one way, we both suffer equally. That's why we all yearn and strive for a world where these standards - which serve to divide us and reduce us and prop up those in control - are destroyed.

In another way these standards serve those who come closest to living up to them. Sure, we all lose when a few men dominate a meeting. But it's those men who get to make decisions, take credit for the work everyone does, and come out feeling more inspired and confident.

But I can't be sexist - I'm a hippie

Oh, but you can. The irony is that you can basically do all the things listed above, even if you don't fit the stereotype of the big strapping man. I've seen hippies, men who would be described as feminine, queer men, and others who in many ways go against the grain not go against the grain at all when it comes to dominating discussion. A hippie might speak slowly and use hippie slang, but still speak as the voice of authority, and cut off the woman who was speaking before him. A man who some might call feminine can still make a face like he smelled something when someone he doesn't respect says something he disagrees with, thus telling her to shut up; he may also politely but consistently put himself on stack every time someone criticizes his proposal.

So shut the fuck up already

What's to be done? I've come up with a little idea I like to call, "Shut the fuck up." It goes as follows: Every time someone...

- * Says something you think is irrelevant,
- * Asks a (seemingly) obvious question,
- * Criticizes your proposal or makes a contradictory observation,
- * Makes a proposal
- * Asks a question, or
- * Asks for more input because there's a brief lull in the discussion. . .

Shut the fuck up. It's a radical process, but I think you'll like it.

Since my childhood, I was raised by my parents and by every teacher I ever had in school to demand as much attention as possible. In class I spoke more often than almost anyone else I knew. Surprisingly enough, some of my teachers were annoyed with me. But while they may have counseled me to raise my hand first, they never asked me to speak less or listen more. As a result I probably got twice as much attention from my teachers, measured in time spent with me, than most of the other kids I went to school with.

But a mere 15 years after I started learning to exhibit almost all the dominating male behavior I list above, something happened. I was in a class with a friend of mine. Let's call her Anne, because that's her name. Anne and I were in the same study group, and the night before she had gone over the exact question the professor was now asking. However, Anne wasn't answering, even though the rest of the class was silent.

I don't know what struck me to actually stop and think instead of answering the question myself, as I was wont to do. That incident got me thinking about who spoke most often in class, why, and what I could do. The answers to the first two questions I've basically given already. The third is a little trickier.

What else can we do?

Lucky for us, being a man gives us a lot of authority. I mean that in a good way, too. Much like people of color are always assumed to be selfish or paranoid when they speak out against racial profiling, women are often assumed to be bitchy when they call out patriarchal behavior.

What does that mean for us? First, we shut the fuck up. This was easy for me in school - I just made a rule that I never spoke more than twice in a 50 minute class. Surprise! Almost every time I would have spoken, someone else eventually said the exact same thing, or something smarter. It was frustrating when it was another obnoxious man doing the answering, but a lot of times it wasn't one of the two guys in class who spoke most often.

The problem is that the classroom is designed to have one person in charge, and it ain't the student. While you could point out problem behavior in class, there's not a lot of 'space' for it - it's not expected or encouraged, and would probably be dismissed by the professor.

The beauty of consensus is the facilitation. Not only can we facilitate ourselves - and we should - but we can facilitate each other. This is mainly the job of the person chosen to be the facilitator. But when the facilitator is ignoring problem behavior - or exhibiting it - it's easy for other people in the group to guerrilla facilitate.'

Sometimes it's as easy as pointing out the people who have their hands up, but are somehow missed by the facilitator, or by suggesting straw polls or go 'rounds or other tools that get everyone involved. But it's usually not that easy. The worse the pattern of behavior in the group, the more natural the fucked-upedness will seem. And you'll often be given the evil eye by the people you're calling out, if not a verbal backlash. And finally, it's obviously not the job of the people most trampled on by patriarchal behavior to always be calling it out. That's where we come in. We are, at least at first, given the most respect when we call out bad behavior.

The problem is doing the calling out in a constructive way. It's all too easy to call people out in a hurtful and authoritarian fashion - thus entertaining everyone with your unintended irony, but also acting the exact way you don't want others to. When you call people out in a way that's hurtful instead of constructive, it still tends to keep the quietest people at a meeting from participating.

The solution

So call people out, but try not to be too personal about it. Unless it's outrageous, wait until the person is finished, and then make your process point about how people should stick to stack, or consider not talking if they've just spoken, or whatever. And if it seems someone's pissed off at your calling them out (and white men make it real easy for you to tell if they're pissed off), make the effort to talk to him after the meeting is over. It usually doesn't take much to smooth ruffled feathers.

Unfortunately, it also doesn't take much for those same people to do the exact same thing the next meeting. So while

part of the answer is self-facilitation and facilitating others, another part is also giving everyone the skills and confidence they need to assert their place in the meeting. This means having regular workshops, for new and experienced activists, on how consensus is supposed to work. It also means going through the formal process of consensus and explaining it during meetings. You can do it quickly, especially after the first few times. But when people assume that everyone is familiar with the process, those who are least confident (but still have good ideas) will be the first to drop out of discussions. Meanwhile, other people who think they know the process but don't tend to hold things up. I'll let you guess what I think the gender breakdown of those groups is.

Another key ingredient is talking to individuals outside of meetings. Talking honestly - "I know you care about the group, but in meetings it seems like you talk down to anyone who disagrees with you, and you cut people off a lot, and that makes it really hard for other people to participate" - is a big part of it. And as with any interaction, you have to keep an open mind to hear their perspective. Ideally, you could resolve things at this level and not have to bring things up before the group.

But it's still a good idea to come up with a structure to address the way people act badly in meetings, for people to regularly "check in" with how they feel the process is going. It also makes it easier for people who wouldn't normally criticize others to do so constructively. The structure could mean that once every two months the group has a "process" meeting, where the focus is on how people act in meetings, working groups, etc. It's often easier and 'safer' for people to call out problem behavior, and easier and 'safer' for the culprits to own up to it and ask for constructive criticism.

Finally, it means constantly thinking about how we, as men, tend to dominate and control the world around us. To me this is most apparent (at least in other people) in meetings. To me, that's also where it's easiest to address. This is a continuous process. We have to always read about this, talk about it, inquire into how others address it, come up with creative and successful solutions, and apply them. But no matter where we take it, I think this struggle always starts with shutting the fuck up.

As men, we're encouraged to dominate conversation without even thinking about it. It's too easy for us to do really good work - fighting genetic engineering, tearing down the prison industrial complex, freeing Mumia - and still act exactly like the frat boy next door. We have to confront each other and ourselves so that domination stops seeming natural, and so we can start doing something about it. So the next time you don't think about how you're talking, please think about how you're talking.

Epilogue

This essay came out of my frustration with the male domination in meetings in this movement and the absence of men's efforts to change it. It also came out of my need for self-reflection. This will ideally lead not just to all men acting exactly like I think they should, but also a lasting dialog on how we behave in meetings and what we can do about it. If you have any thoughts on what I've written, please contact me and tell me what you think dan@midnightspecial.net. This isn't a declaration of war; it's just a starting point.

Time for me to shut the fuck up.

[Add new comment](#) 1022 reads [Printer-friendly version](#)

Comments

...
Submitted by Make Total Destroy! (not verified) on Tue, 05/12/2009 - 10:44.

This was written by a white male that made broad assumptions about others gender identity and intentions. It violated the security and consent of those at the event it was prompted by. This piece is hypocritical in nature and certainly shouldn't be praised. As a matter of fact, if any fingers were to be pointed, I would state that the behavior of the author of this piece is full of more offensive sexist shit than that day actually contained.

Furthermore, I'm not in disagreement with the actual article "Shut the fuck up". White males need to shut the fuck up in a lot of if not most instances. But being one who falls into the category of often shutting the fuck up, I'm seeing this instance as a prime example of over played semantics, hyper-sensitivity, and mechanically mediated discussion leading to once again, all to much talk and no action.

In my mind this piece echos 2 things.

1. It indirectly implies that violence is exclusive to men. That trans, queer, and female bodied folk are frail. Failing to recognize those whom wish to BASH BACK! or even to acknowledge their presence in a room. And claims that what the author thinks female bodied folks want is in actuality what they truly want (if this original post is any indication, that's clearly not the case).

2. Being the authors roommate, I see this text to be just as mediated as his interactions with me or any other of my room mates. This article is clearly an example of how folks in the Twin Cities need to start having productive face to face dialogue and not run off to our computers/websites to publish infactual, passive aggressive, shit on the internet where the feds can clearly identify vulnerabilities and act to exploit them/us.

In closing, I feel that this piece (at least the earliest portion written by the author) is sexist, dishonest, and embarrassing to say the least.

In the future I would highly suggest thinking twice about calling female bodied/queer/or white male bodied folk man-archists before washing effort of those who put tons of time and energy into a weekend that was directed towards MIDWEST ANARCHIST NETWORKING with petty politically correctness and basic insults.

[reply](#)

Jo, you ARE in a position of power

Submitted by H. Stone on Mon, 05/11/2009 - 15:05.

"I am more interested in arming my comrades who lack privilege than I am with laying down my arms so that the disempowered feel more comfortable in my presence. Lets save our wrath and rebuke for those in positions of power and not for each other." -Jo

White, able-bodied straight men have privilege. It is real. It is power. You may not be **AS** powerful as the wealthy elite that run the world, but it is power. Asking (OK demanding) that white men shut up sometimes and give other folks a chance to participate **IS** "arming your comrades." What the heck do men (or any privileged folks) have to prove in a meeting of allies, ferchrissakes? Why would they need "their arms?"

I'm not a huge fan of the combative tone that the post was delivered in (so good points on that), but the underlying concept that more privileged folks should not be the only ones participating is completely sound.

[reply](#)

"the underlying concept that

Submitted by Anonymous (not verified) on Mon, 05/11/2009 - 15:33.

"the underlying concept that more privileged folks should not be the only ones participating is completely sound"

Duh... This as much as it has been discussed was not actually the issue, (the issue is not the issue) but more when we talk of violence it is assumed to be a male and discussion degenerates to the same guilt ridden hand wringing and tokenizing that is a hallmark of "anti-oppression" discourse. It is implied that anyone other than white males are obligated to contribute not because they have interesting things to say, but because they fall into assumed essential categories of not white, not male, etc. As soon as privilege is spoken a fence has been erected around any further conversation.

[reply](#)

The discussion thus far

Submitted by Anonymous (not verified) on Mon, 05/11/2009 - 14:53.

The discussion thus far evidenced a fundamental misunderstanding of what it might mean to be an insurrectionary anarchist (at least among some who spoke this weekend or who are commenting on this site).

Above all it is a strategic tendency more than it could ever be called an ideology.

From Wikipedia:

"Insurrectionary anarchism is a revolutionary theory, practice and tendency within the [anarchist](#) movement which opposes formal organizations such as labor unions and federations that are based on a political programme and periodic congresses. Instead, insurrectionary anarchists advocate direct action (violent or otherwise), informal organization, including small affinity groups and mass organizations which include non-anarchist individuals of the exploited or excluded class."

[reply](#)

In defense of "manarchy"

Submitted by Anonymous (not verified) on Mon, 05/11/2009 - 13:48.

As anyone with any sort of privilege stands on it here in the U.S., it is held up by those under oppression both here and abroad. Those bearing the burden created by our way of life and engaged in resistance to in other countries have a greater sense of urgency and often face greater consequence for their actions. And yet militant resistance is more common and popular on the edges of the empire than here in its epicenter.

Why is that? Because the privileges we hold make us comfortable. Are positions living in the heart of the beast should come with an even greater responsibility to end the suffering caused by it **right now!** We could choke the very life out of the beast and end its domination of the planet if we only took that power into our hands. Every day we wait is another day that rainforests are being cut down somewhere. Every day thousands more tons of toxic shit are dumped into the ocean. Everyday is another day in this cage.

If the Revolution will only happen when we are all perfect human beings and treat each other with perfect respect, then the revolution will never come because people will always fuck up occasionally.

The ability to sit in meetings all day long comes from a position of relative comfort within this system. The people whose liberation is most urgent are too busy surviving to sit around and talk about who is talking most in meetings. Where is your sense of urgency?

Forgive me when the sense of urgency I feel being poor in a capitalist system--in spite of being a white male--is to great for me to keep my mouth shut in a meeting. Has it ever occurred to you that perhaps marginalized people have been forcibly silenced at times in their lives and telling them that what they have to contribute is not welcome, "Shut the Fuck Up!" could be re-traumatizing?

If you call someone a manarchist for being an Insurrectionist, you are perpetuating the myth that only men can or should be violent or aggressive.

If my privilege is a sword and anger is a weapon. I am more interested in arming my comrades who lack privilege than I am with laying down my arms so that the disempowered feel more comfortable in my presence. Let's save our wrath and rebuke for those in positions of power and not for each other.

Yes, I do think I do deserve some credit for showing up at a meeting. And No, I don't like that I am expected to say less than others. How many people with privilege do not show up to meetings at all? How many of them show up to a job working to reinforce systems of oppression, not dismantle them?

I am a white male wanting to be a part of a movement to destroy systems of oppression world wide, including those

which give me privilege. The more I feel less welcome or appreciated the more likely I am to drop out and become a libertarian or a socialist.

Fuck that! I am an Anarchist because no one can decide what that means to me but me. And no one can decide what Anarchism means to you but you. **The movement gets divided is when people allow other people to define what the movement is.**

My Two Cents

jo

[reply](#)

"Fuck that! I am an Anarchist

Submitted by Anonymous (not verified) on Mon, 05/11/2009 - 23:13.

"Fuck that! I am an Anarchist because no one can decide what that means to me but me. And no one can decide what Anarchism means to you but you. **The movement gets divided is when people allow other people to define what the movement is.**"

Anarchism is not about being an unaccountable individual. And it is certainly not about being an asshole.

Shut the fuck up and grow up.

[reply](#)

A movement that is divided

Submitted by Anonymous (not verified) on Tue, 05/12/2009 - 00:43.

A movement that is divided into how each individual defines it is certainly not one of solidarity. Moreover, the act of discussing this topic, and even being critical of a point of view, does not indicate a fractured movement as most would have you believe. Instead, it's the necessary order of things. It allows us to find common places of agreement and actually allows for solidarity. Holding in criticism of tactics by certain groups only serves to show the outside world a silly solidarity front. True solidarity involves critical thinking, and thus moves the movement forward. Of course everyone has a different point of view. Why can't we allow these differences to collectively shape the future? There must be underlying themes that we can all build upon. Together we can define the movement from different angles.

[reply](#)

Holy shit Mao!!!

Submitted by Make Total Destroy! (not verified) on Tue, 05/12/2009 - 10:53.

"A movement that is divided into how each individual defines it is certainly not one of solidarity."

So what would you propose? Everyone in the movement define it the same way? Fuck that. You can be in solidarity with folk that you have hardly anything in common with. For example, although I am disgusted by some folks effed up perspectives on this comment thread, I would be in absolute solidarity with any of them if they got arrested at a picket, a sewing party, an anti-oppression discussion, a lock down, or a riot. Anarchists are autonomists that wont ever define "anarchy" the same. Its all a matter of how we work with each other.

[reply](#)

i still feel this is violation of consent and security

Submitted by shug (not verified) on Mon, 05/11/2009 - 09:44.

The consulta was a closed event. taking any of it and talking about it or relaying it onto a public forum is a violation of consent and security -- it doesnt need to be sensitive info for that to be the case. you did not have consent granted to start this.

i feel further violated to know now that a friend of mine posted this instead of talking in real life with those around them -- in fact being dishonest to avoid talking to me when i approached them [redacted for reasons under discussion - eds]. please take this whole article and all comments down -- and instead have the courage to talk in person.

reply

We've BEEN talking..

Submitted by Kristin (not verified) on Mon, 05/11/2009 - 10:40.

I'm sorry you feel that way, and would like also to clarify that the author did not "start this" by any means. People have been trying for months upon months to get the community/allies to start talking about these major problems, often being cast as "the angry one," "looking for an argument," "wasting time on stupid shit," etc in the process. This bullying wasn't limited only to a consulta and one weekend. Many people in the TC have dropped out of/stepped back from organizing because they felt totally excluded and alienated through abuses of varying oppressions within the TC radical community, and a disturbing proportion of us are womyn-id'd folk. The fact that this has been allowed to happen [hopefully] until now has been a source of incredible frustration for many and creating safe spaces to voice these concerns has been a tremendous challenge.

Without discounting your feeling of violation concerning consent and security..what would it take for you to be okay with this conversation continuing? Maybe we could unite around strictly not talking about the consulta as an example?

reply

a clarification

Submitted by the author (not verified) on Sun, 05/10/2009 - 19:42.

it perhaps should have been said in the original article: 85% of this piece was either already in my head or already written throughout the last two weeks. whether or not any particular event or incident took place over the weekend, this still would've been posted sooner or later.

also, my name's not rob. posting this anonymously was an intentional decision, meant to stave off personal attacks in the comments section (comments sections, after all, being "democratic" technological innovations whereby people who already talk way too much are easily able to talk even more) -- so if you wish to at least acknowledge that what I have to say has value, one way to do that would be to refrain from personal attacks or naming names in discussion here.

also, if there's a good reason that you must know who I am, I've outed myself, so ask some friends. finally, i probably won't reply to any comments here; please don't take that personally.

reply

Let's work towards more productive discussions

Submitted by A Mpls anarchist (not verified) on Sun, 05/10/2009 - 16:49.

I was there for the entirety of yesterday's sessions, and for all of today up till 4 p.m. I'd like to talk more about this with everyone involved, but my sense is that tempers are still running way too hot to make today's discussion productive. I hope I'll be proved wrong. I think people on both "sides" had valid points, but I also heard a number of people speak up at the beginning of the day yesterday (i.e. before the actual confrontation) in a way that made it pretty clear they were spoiling for a fight. I know people are still discussing this as I type, but in the future, please,

please, please think before you speak and realize that using demeaning, dismissive and just plain mean language at an anarchist gathering only serves to weaken us and strengthen our enemies.

I'm still in solidarity with all of you, even if you don't believe it.

[reply](#)

This is one of the most

Submitted by Anonymous (not verified) on Sun, 05/10/2009 - 15:58.

This is one of the most embarrassing texts produced by the anarchist milieu I've ever read.

[reply](#)

Nah.

Submitted by Anonymous (not verified) on Sun, 05/10/2009 - 17:11.

You need to read more, then. Compared to some of the things that persyns who should know better have coughed up, this is nothing. Oh, it's angstful and self-righteous in a kind of cute way, but for sheer embarrassment, not even a contender.

I would say it could be in the top ten so far this year, but I've a nagging feeling that not only is the Gregorian calendar a tool of white, patriarchal oppression, but numbers imply hierarchy, so they're bad, too.

[reply](#)

oh the controversy!

Submitted by Anonymous (not verified) on Sun, 05/10/2009 - 15:29.

Aside from the usual activist discourse that has formed a prison around the Twin Cities "anarchist" community, why did those for whom the flier and promotion of the "Doing-Being" convergence obviously did not inspire positively decide they would attend to come souly to derail conversation? What desire motivates the anti-oppressive police to impose themselves upon a situation that clearly did not include them? Is this control not a form of violence? How manly...

Posibily the terrain of the convergence, all too familiar to the activist, produced all too familiar conversations and severe limitations regardless of howls of wolves on the covers of such controversial brochures. What dialog manifested sought by all means to reproduce this pathetic discourse through its subtle manipulations, jargon, categorization, spirit fingers and always mediation. Always mediation... What else but a facilitated mediation could hold such a staggering prison together?

[reply](#)

"anti-oppressive police"

Submitted by Nick (not verified) on Mon, 05/11/2009 - 11:03.

Why are folks still holding on to this dichotomy between anti-oppression and insurrection?

What I'm hearing is this:

"Why can't we just get together to get shit done and not be held accountable"

and

"We tried to exclude the voices of the 'anti-oppression police' when we were planning this meeting, how dare they show up and hold people accountable"

I truly hope this is a misinterpretation on my part because there should not be any spaces in the anarchist community where people are not being held accountable. If getting called out is preventing us from 'getting shit done', then clearly we have a lot more anti-oppression work to do to create a sustainable community where people are not routinely feeling oppressed and or silenced.

[reply](#)

I don't think that being

Submitted by Anonymous (not verified) on Mon, 05/11/2009 - 11:34.

I don't think that being militant in my desire to put an end to the things that are killing us as soon as fucking possible is something that is oppressive and needs to be called out. Sexist, heteronormative, patriarchal, racist, etc etc behaviors always need to be called out and the perpetrators held accountable. Nobody is in any way denying that and if anyone got that impression I'm pretty sure they weren't listening.

It is my impression that this consulta was for everyone who considers themselves an anarchist, BUT it was coming out of an insurrectionary action-based analysis. A desire to have more actions, not less. I'm pretty sure most folks were aware of that, and it is totally fucking disrespectful, and (oppressive!) to bring your crew that wants to push forward a happy media friendly version of anarchy that at the expense of any talk of action.

It would be really fucked up if a crew of anti-civ anarchists showed up at a consulta organized by their wobbly friends with the sole intent of derailing the conversations and insisting that they need to focus on torching the fucking workplace instead of organizing it. Actually, I'd say that the wobblies and the anti-civ anarchists are getting along really well in this town right now. That is because we show each other solidarity by going to each others events and even doing joint fundraisers, and that is possible because we don't impose our personal views of anarchy on each other. THAT is respect and accountability within the wide and varied anarchist community in the TC.

[reply](#)

As a Wobbly, I agree with

Submitted by Anonymous (not verified) on Mon, 05/11/2009 - 17:27.

As a Wobbly, I agree with this last bit. I didn't go to the consulta 'cause it didn't seem like the perspectives there interested me, but it's great that the greens and the reds (to use gross generalizations) in the far left/anarchist scene can get along as well as we do. There's times to work together and times to work apart and that's okay and actually probably healthy.

[reply](#)

working together

Submitted by Anonymous (not verified) on Mon, 05/11/2009 - 23:57.

I think that folks in the twin cities anarchist scenes are actually very bad at working together and supporting one another when there are possibilities and room for that...or at least I'm one of the people who is interested in trying to do that and not dismiss people or actions because we put each other in boxes so much and don't want to associate with people who aren't in the same box. I understand there are legitimate differences and gripes, but I hear so many snide comments from friends mocking other types of anarchists and people trivializing differences when we have a lot in common. Maybe others aren't willing to break down these boundaries a bit and support one another when we do agree, and you have every right not to do that. Free association is a beautiful thing. But I encourage folks to not dig trenches where a line in the sand would suffice, to re-examine stereotypes they have about other anarchists, and to look for places and people where we can work together. Since I am also a wobbly, I will note that I have been frustrated with snide comments and prejudiced attitudes in the union towards other types of anarchism and I haven't seen very many wobs support other anarchists

locally. On the other hand, and of course these two observations feed into one another, very few other anarchists in town seem to ever come to any wobbly events or support us in any way. But I don't blame them if we don't have their backs either. solidarity forever my ass

[reply](#)

working together

Submitted by Anonymous (not verified) on Mon, 05/11/2009 - 23:56.

I think that folks in the twin cities anarchist scenes are actually very bad at working together and supporting one another when there is possibilities and room for that...or at least I'm one of the people who is interested in trying to do that and not dismiss people or actions because we put eachother in boxes so much and don't want to associate with people who aren't in the same box. I understand there are legitimate differences and gripes, but I hear so many snide comments from friends mocking other types of anarchists and people trivializing differences when we have a lot in common. Maybe others aren't willing to break down these boundaries a bit and support one another when we do agree, and you have every right not to do that. Free association is a beautiful thing. But I encourage folks to not dig trenches where a line in the sand would suffice, to re-examine stereotypes they have about other anarchists, and to look for places and people where we can work together. Since I am also a wobbly, I will note that I have been frustrated with snide comments and prejudiced attitudes in the union towards other types of anarchism and I haven't seen very many wobs support other anarchists locally. On the other hand, and of course these two observations feed into one another, very few other anarchists in town seem to ever come to any wobbly events or support us in any way. But I don't blame them if we don't have their backs either. solidarity forever my ass

[reply](#)

hells yeah

Submitted by parsons (not verified) on Sun, 05/10/2009 - 14:54.

It's about time there was some good discussion on TC Indymedia. Thanks Rob for kicking it off. I generally thought it was a good post and I don't read you as trying to speak for other people as some respondents have alleged. I would like those folks to explain more explicitly how they feel that this essay did that. I know that does happen sometimes (quite often in fact) but I don't see Rob doing that in this case.

HOWEVER I wasn't at said meeting but word to those who called out Rob for making generalizations that presume to know how other people identify and in effect erase the presence of people of color, non-male-identified or non-male-bodied folks with sweeping statements like "15 male-bodied anarchists sit together on one side of the room." I've done done that shit before and was thankfully called out on it.

BUT To the persyn who alleged queer-bashing for being told to shut the fuck up, I think that is only true if you are singled out for exhibiting oppressive behaviours while other folks are let slide. Dominating behaviour is fucked up no matter who does it, and yeah, that most definitely includes female-bodied genderqueers such as myself. If I am singled out for my behaviour, then that is gender policing, but if certain behaviours are generally being called out and I am one of the people acting in those ways, then shit please don't hesitate to call my ass out becuae you are afraid it's queer-bashing or patriachal. Women-identified folks need to be called out when they act oppressively as well. The behaviour is the problem, regardless of who does it. That said, in my experience it is usually white male-identified dudes, but that is the way they are socially conditioned and it isn't anything inherent in white dudes and not exhibited by others, but thankfully we can work together to create other ways of existing. Word to Luce: being an anarchist, in my humble opinion, means struggling to end all oppression, be it the state, capitalism, prisons, but also oppressive behaviors and relationships.

[reply](#)

Wasn't me that wrote the

Submitted by rob (not verified) on Sun, 05/10/2009 - 17:18.

Wasn't me that wrote the article- i wasn't there- but thanks.

-rob

[reply](#)

want to talk in person?

Submitted by lindsey (not verified) on Sun, 05/10/2009 - 13:24.

as part of the midwest anarchist consulta, there is a workshop today at 4pm that (as i understand it) is going to be talking about some of these issues. info about the consulta is under the event page on indymedia. so, you're invited. lets see if we can get somewhere with this.

[reply](#)

Weren't you the one who left

Submitted by Anonymous (not verified) on Sun, 05/10/2009 - 14:57.

Weren't you the one who left the conversation after starting it?

[reply](#)

This piece reflects my experience...

Submitted by Frowner on Sun, 05/10/2009 - 13:04.

....As a female-bodied person in radical scenes in MPLS. I stopped calling myself an anarchist and stopped doing political work primarily with anarchists some years ago, then came back because I met some awesome folks doing anti-RNC work.

I have been dismayed lately to find that folks still use "where were you at the riot?" rhetoric to win their arguments. Not only does this devalue--as the article above says--other contributions to our work, but it's also incredibly judgemental and moralizing, as if there were one correct way to perform anarchism. And while, yeah, women, queers and people of color can riot just as much as straight white men (often enough can riot more), it's also true that "where were you at the riot" means that anyone who has health issues, legal issues, personal trauma stuff, family responsibilities, economic responsibilities, other social responsibilities--anyone who just can't make fucking shit up the cornerstone of their activism gets written out of the story. And those people are disproportionately women, older folks, people of color, queer folks. It also means that there's shame created around not performing anarchism "correctly".

I mean, people have been saying this about anarchists for years and years, over and over, in this town and in others. We're not making it up. If you're hearing over and over that there's a problem with macho, competitive, judgemental behavior among anarchists, that's because it's there. If you're seeing people drop out with the same complaint over and over, that's because the complaint is real. (And since the mid-nineties I've seen this happen in three major cycles just in this town--it would be nice if this time we could speak honestly, be heard and keep people in the movement.)

As far as this essay goes--it's written by a white cis- man speaking to other white cis- men. That's completely appropriate; to be praised, in fact.

[reply](#)

Any persyn who asks "where

Submitted by Anonymous (not verified) on Sun, 05/10/2009 - 22:57.

Any persyn who asks "where were you at the riot?" is obviously an idiot and in blatant violation of security culture. We do not know who is behind the masks at the summit, who the ninjas are that break stuff at night. I don't want to know and neither should you.

The argument that insurrectionary action is invalid because it is something that certain people are unable to do is tired and just plain, well, stupid. I am a persyn who can not be arrested because I have obligations to my children, but that certainly doesn't mean that I don't desire insurrection. And my friends that can take more

action certainly don't think that I am "lame" or a "bad anarchist" for choosing to raise hella awesome kids instead of fucking shit up with them right now. And they help me out with childcare and making spaces safe for us, something that I can't say about anyone who was claiming that they cared about anti-oppression work. I guess my white anarchist family isn't worthy of their support.

If people of privilege care about being an ally to those that are oppressed, maybe they should actually fight back and destroy this fucking thing that is killing us. Or maybe you'd rather spend your time going to endless meetings and derailing consultas because you profit from your position in this disgusting society. But will you boring-ass liberals please stop speaking for us?! We can take care of ourselves and each other.

[reply](#)

OUCH

Submitted by Kristin H (not verified) on Sun, 05/10/2009 - 23:57.

I care about anti oppression work. I also hung out with some cool kids twice this weekend, and once overnight. Don't call me a fucking liberal.

You want people to create safe spaces for you? Me too! You deserve them! But try actually giving a fuck about others need in order for that to happen for *them*. Mutual aid? Basic respect?

It's important to address everything people are bringing up, and not to say, "I don't care how you feel and that's okay," unconditionally. There is no accountability there. That makes me feel unsafe. And it feels incredibly abusive. Exactly how is that attitude different than the supposed attitudes we're trying to fight/change (which are killing us)?

If ya'll didn't want all people who identify as anarchists to come, then ya'll should've specified and not wasted the time of a whole lot of people. People who helped cook for 40+ people at less than a day's notice, people who readily made themselves available for childcare, people who worked hard at putting together workshops..etc.

-Kristin

[reply](#)

People seem far often too

Submitted by Anonymous (not verified) on Mon, 05/11/2009 - 15:12.

People seem far often too forget another fundamental tenent of anarchist practice, that of voluntary association and affinity. If people did not find affinity with those who made the flier/ promoted the event, then why did they impose themselves upon the convergence? Anarchy is not a big tent where we all get along, maybe anarchism in the US is, but this is but one of its problematics. There are no safe spaces, and no ammount of magical thinking wills away the conflict inherent to our current conditions. Minnesota nice needs to get uncomfortable with itself.

[reply](#)

Its unfortunate that it

Submitted by Anonymous (not verified) on Mon, 05/11/2009 - 18:11.

Its unfortunate that it finally took a consulta for anarchists for these issues in the TC anarchist community to finally be addressed. It is also unfortunate that anarchists in the TC decided to host this consulta without first consulting the rest of the TC anarchist community to see where everyone else was it and what the impacts of the consulta might bring down. But maybe that speaks to the lack of any sort of meaningful community that exists among the organizers of the consulta and in the TC as a whole.

[reply](#)

Word to that, though it's

Submitted by Anonymous An-Com (not verified) on Mon, 05/11/2009 - 17:22.

Word to that, though it's unfortunate. I didn't go to the consulta this weekend because I knew it would be full of insurrectionist and anti-civ perspectives. Not a rip on you all, but after years of trying to get along, I find it harder and harder to work on issues that I care about as an anarchist communist (worker's power, unionism, community organizing, working class feminism and anti-racism) with the flavor of anarchists who put together the consulta.

[reply](#)

Drop out...

Submitted by Anonymous (not verified) on Sun, 05/10/2009 - 12:18.

I am just one of many people I know who have mostly dropped out of the radical political scene altogether because of being sick to death of dealing with manarchists and the macho mentality that a lot of the radical community fosters... ya'll are overwhelming. Its to the point that I have a hard time wanting to be associated with "our community" whatsoever. Go ahead, judge my feelings and words about this, criticize and 'kindly' suggest things to me from your superior, privledged white male perspective. You will never understand. and your words no longer mean anything to me.

[reply](#)

Interestingly enough, it is

Submitted by Basil (not verified) on Sun, 05/10/2009 - 20:33.

Interestingly enough, it is things like this article and the discussion that happened yesterday that make me want to drop out of all such anarchist bullshit. I am sick of mediation. I am sick of people censoring themselves. I am sick of the fake-ass ways people interact in these situations. Congratulations, anarcho-liberals, you can have it!

[reply](#)

good point

Submitted by Anonymous (not verified) on Tue, 05/12/2009 - 00:33.

There are infinite reasons people get frustrated and/or drop out of anarchist scenes. This article was an attempt by someone to explain something that he felt had been driving a lot of folks away locally. This is by no means THE problem pushing people away. But it is something we need to address or in the very least people need to be aware of other peoples concerns and make our own decisions from there.

I hope that those who are frustrated or have "dropped out" get involved with other things/people or create something new that suits them better. I've moved on from plenty of folks, orgs, tactics, etc. If what you're involved with isn't worth it to you anymore, then find/create something else. The possibilities are endless. We can't be afraid to move on when things aren't working out anymore. Organizing is full of set backs, missteps, and we learn and change in the process. We are always in a process of becoming.

Concretely I advise people to do prisoner support work if you're not already. This is for three reasons: 1) it's the right thing to do, 2) It's a way to contribute to "the movement" and make a difference in peoples lives in which you don't have to put up with whatever it is that is frustrating with you. If you're burnt out on meetings, street actions, whatever, write some poetry and drawings and letters and send them to prisoners. If you want to party then organize a fundraiser in support of political prisoners. 3) If you feel sorry for yourself about how shitty you have it on the outside, relationships with people in prison will put your frustrations in perspective. Their lives are worth fighting for and so is yours. Whether or not you struggle, in whatever ways you chose, makes a fucking difference. keep on keepin on.

[reply](#)

Name calling doesn't do the work of analysis

Submitted by Frowner on Mon, 05/11/2009 - 05:57.

"Anarcho-liberal", "you're either a coward or a cop", etc etc...That's not analysis; it's bullying. It's rhetoric that works to make people flinch without thinking--'Oh, liberals are terrible, someone made up this undefined term anarcho-liberal, I don't want to be associated with those anarcho-liberals, I'll stay away from their political positions'.

That's pretty gross, and it's also just like what orthodox communist organizations did while they were still dominant on the left--you don't want to be a 'fascist', do you? You don't want to be 'bourgeois' by talking about your personal problems or suggesting that maybe Comrade Elizabeth could run the meeting for once instead of Comrade Ilya, or that Stalin on linguistics isn't exactly awesome. And we all saw how that turned out.

This stuff isn't exactly new on the left, or even among anarchists. There's always some phrase going around to paste on the people you disagree with so that you can put them in a tidy little box.

Let's call out behavior instead of making up new terms of abuse.

[reply](#)

We're not inventing a new

Submitted by Basil (not verified) on Mon, 05/11/2009 - 12:24.

We're not inventing a new phrase. Liberals exist. The problem is when they pretend to be anarchists. Obviously calling people out, and challenging all forms of oppression is intrinsic to what we do. But mediated garbage such as what happened this weekend, should have nothing to do with our shit.

[reply](#)

Yeah because there is nothing

Submitted by Anonymous (not verified) on Mon, 05/11/2009 - 09:24.

Yeah because there is nothing wrong with calling womyn, queer people, and people of color manarchist.

[reply](#)

queer people and people of

Submitted by Anonymous (not verified) on Mon, 05/11/2009 - 19:11.

queer people and people of color can't be sexist or patriarchal?

[reply](#)

of course they can be. but

Submitted by Anonymous (not verified) on Tue, 05/12/2009 - 09:23.

of course they can be. but when speaking about anti-oppression maybe the staright white guy should think twice before throwing queer people, womyn, and poc into the "manarchist" category...especially when it is along a tactical division.

[reply](#)

Also...

Submitted by The Whatever Singularity (not verified) on Sun, 05/10/2009 - 09:28.

We were the ones who left your conversation and went to do childcare with awesome kids. Not because we were told to, or expected to, not because it was an obligation, but because we think these kids are the coolest and would love to spend more of our time making up stories and running around with them and want more time acting and less time talking about how we need more childcare and less action.

[reply](#)

Oh! Yay! Let's speak for the oppressed! That's anti-oppression!

Submitted by The Whatever Singularity (not verified) on Sun, 05/10/2009 - 09:18.

So here I'll say that until yesterday, I was refusing to identify as an insurrectionist. You know, on top of identifying as female-bodied, genderqueer, queer, youth, working class, and a persyn of mixed race, since identities seem to be of so much emphasis here. Thanks for speaking for me, time and time again, in the consulta and outside of it, here on the internet and in a city of which I do not reside. Maybe you don't know the insurrectionists who were sitting in the back, those you described as "15 male-bodied anarchists sit[ting] together on one side of the room".

Our argument wasn't one in which we were arguing against community and for outright revolt; our messages differed for each of us-- Some wanted more emotion, others thought discourse and conflict were needed instead of being smoothed over and forgotten, others, still, felt that anti-oppression work is important. We wanted to strengthen our friendships, our bonds, and become something other than an arbitrary group of people who connect every once in awhile for some political bullshit.

Why? Because we all face oppression. And as for most insurrectionists I know? We're queer, or trans, or people of color, or female-bodied, or more than one of the above. To some extent that should matter; in others, though, when those who identify as straight, white, or male, or all of the above, tell us that we should speak more, that they know we're feeling oppressed, etc., it reeks of guilt. Looking around the room and then telling us that there are too many white males speaking doesn't make me want to speak more. Likewise, when I do speak, I feel excluded, ignored, or brushed aside because my thoughts coincide with my male-bodied/identified friends (not allies here, they're more than that).

I'm not from here, but something I've heard time and time again in the Twin Cities is the idea that militancy can be or is alienating to queerfolks, or people of color, or female-bodied people. What the fucking fuck?! For one, that thought-process further perpetuates an idea that people with these identities are frail, or can not do the militant and violent work of "the men". In reality, from what I have also noticed in the Twin Cities, the people of color, the queers

bashing back, the mothers, and the female-bodied folks make up a primary group of these so-called "15 male-bodied anarchists sit[ting] together on one side of the room", and we're not going to shut the fuck up.

[reply](#)

white male speaks for female-bodied people! news at 11!

Submitted by the woman on University Ave with the middle finger (not verified) on Sun, 05/10/2009 - 08:23.

It's really fucking frustrating when well-meaning people look around meetings that are, yes, mostly white, or a group of people that may or may not mostly identify as male, and completely erase the existence of the people of color or people who identify as women within them by saying things like "15 male-bodied people on one side of the room." Really? Did you fail to see the young female-assigned person who was driven to tears by her frustration with the anarcho-liberals in the room? Or the women who spoke up time and time again? The fact that several of the people you're referring to are queer, and were talking about their oppressions? Or the fact that they later left to do child care?

Did you actually listen to what those folks were saying? They were not saying that all the movement needs is riots. Far from it. Their points were multiple and varied. One was that people should stop making assumptions about who others are or where they were coming from; another was describing their experiences being queer-bashed both within and outside "the movement" -- experiences which include being told to "shut the fuck up."

To the extent that you may have only heard them speak about rioting, it was because you weren't fully listening -- or you're eliding their points to make yours. Some of the people on that side of the room may have talked about that stuff more than they had wanted to, because they didn't feel free to speak about other things; others didn't feel free to speak at all. They had anti-oppression analyses and criticisms too, but didn't feel like they could speak them in that room. They felt censored or attacked or uncomfortable there. Not because they were female-bodied in the presence of scary insurrectionists, but because there was not space there for them to be both. Well-meaning people like yourself very much contributed to this dynamic.

I think there are possibilities for us all to work together and get along. We need all the tools in the toolbox. The insurrectionists among us need to stop prizing militant action above all else, and to be more strategic in any number of ways; the anti-oppression folks among us need to focus on action as well as language, and to stop making assumptions about who is oppressed and what they think (behavior that I would argue is oppressive in and of itself). Perhaps we can start now.

[reply](#)

The fact that "the

Submitted by luce (not verified) on Sun, 05/10/2009 - 10:01.

The fact that "the anti-oppression folks" is even a distinct category in this comment says a lot about the particular insular anarchistsocial circle y'all are talking about here. Real anarchists are ALL anti-oppression folks, and most of the people walking the walk these days are the same ones talking the anti-oppression talk. And it seems you've missed a major point, here, which is that the "militant action" in question here- riots, smashy smashy, the glorification of vandalism and violence- that's generally ascribed to insurrectionists isn't inherently militant at all, and that a lot of other shit people (yep, even "anti-oppression folks") do all the time IS militant.

Maybe instead of focusing on the ins and outs of who said what and who felt what amongst the people that showed up, you should think about the people that didn't bother to come at all and ask yourselves why. I'm one of those people, and I can tell you for damn certain that it wasn't because I'm not militant enough.

And props to the author of the original post for finally calling shit out that a lot of us have been getting pretty fucking sick of around Minneapolis lately.

[reply](#)

"What is Manarchism?...It's

Submitted by Anonymous (not verified) on Sun, 05/10/2009 - 22:39.

"What is Manarchism?...It's what I struggle with after seeing frat boys riot the same evening, then sit through hearing my male-bodied comrades praise them (or scorn them for not being violent enough) the next day."

Heard the Frat Boys were going to be turning out for the consulta. Were these the anarcho-liberals meentioned above?

"The fact that "the anti-oppression folks" is even a distinct category in this comment says a lot about the particular insular anarchistsocial circle y'all are talking about here. "

'Nough said.

[reply](#)

anyone and everyone posting

Submitted by shug (not verified) on Sun, 05/10/2009 - 11:58.

anyone and everyone posting arguments regarding anything having to do with a private meeting that is supposed to be safe is in blatant violation of consent and security. you should be ashamed of yourselves and go the fuck home.

[reply](#)

Some of the information and

Submitted by Anonymous (not verified) on Sun, 05/10/2009 - 15:08.

Some of the information and views expressed in that conversation may need to be kept private, as well as the identities of participants, but I fail to see how anything said on here has actually disclosed anything that puts anyone at risk. Security Culture doesn't mean you need to be paranoid.

[reply](#)

devide and conquer

Submitted by Anonymous (not verified) on Sun, 05/10/2009 - 12:14.

whoever came to the consulta to pick these fights rather than move forward (and do so without talking to

people but rather by posting this here).....you are either a coward or a cop.

[reply](#)

I'd love to talk to you, but

Submitted by (not afraid to use my name) Rob (not verified) on Sun, 05/10/2009 - 13:50.

I'd love to talk to you, but you posted anonymously. How are we supposed to talk if I don't know who you are? And claiming a meeting is "private"(after promoting it on the interwebz) or saying security culture is violated by calling out BS is a way to avoid that conversation. As someone who in the past was guilty of alienating people and allies by macho posturing and other behaviors, I for one am glad this conversation is happening. Guess what, people are upset by things said and done and we cannot claim to be "anti-oppression" if we disregard those people as "anarcho-liberals". To have a meeting and then say you can't discuss some very real issues is not allowing accountability to happen.

We need to move forward from this. As Frowner pointed out, this has happened here in the past before- leaving us fractured, bitter, burnout, and embarrassed.

We can have all we dream about and more. Let's start by admitting that none of us have any answers.

[reply](#)

no one is calling people who

Submitted by queermo present. (not verified) on Sun, 05/10/2009 - 14:16.

no one is calling people who do anti-oppression work anarcho-liberals. But rather people who are using their guilt to stall progress anarcho-liberals. It is funny that people keep ignoring the women and queer people who said they were alienated not because of the "insurrectionists" but because white men kept insisting that they speak up, and when they spoke up their concerns were ignored. I.E. the female bodied person who said that they were uncomfortable for not being in the circle. But when people kept asking why those outside of the circle were uncomfortable they only posed that question to the scary male bodied "insurrectionists" who by the way were not even uncomfortable with sitting in the circle, they just would have rather not sit in chairs. In fact it was queer people and female-bodied people who have been involved with anti-oppression work for years that used the term anrcho-liberals. Destroy patriarchy in ourselves, the movement, and beyond...take down the future beaurocrats with it.

using the term insurrectionists not because those people identified themselves as that in the moment but because other people put that label on them

[reply](#)

What now?

Submitted by db apparently user is taken (not verified) on Sun, 05/10/2009 - 20:54.

I know there will be good things. Curious to know what! That's all.

<3

db

[reply](#)

security culture irony

Submitted by Anonymous (not verified) on Mon, 05/11/2009 - 11:22.

As someone who was not at the consulta, i was completely unaware that the original post

had anything to do about the consulta until Shug mentioned it. Ironic that the concern about making consulta happenings private was what made thme public.

Now it's time for ex-middle class, white, male-bodied me to Shut the Fuck.

[reply](#)